

## Restoration, Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds (FINAL)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700554

### A. List of Restoration Activities

The Inyo National Forest is proposing to do planning to determine restoration needs including full project designs and any additional environmental analysis, on approximately 641 closed routes in the Upper Owens Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 5 watershed (571 routes) and the Bishop Creek HUC 5 watershed (70 routes). Both these watersheds are "priority watersheds" for restoration and maintenance of water quality on the Forest. These are also municipal watersheds providing water for Southern California. These routes were not designated as part of the National Forest Transportation System (NFTS), per the Forests Record of Decision (ROD) of the Travel Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) signed in December of 2009 for the Inyo. Routes not designated vary from recently created user routes to routes that have been in place for several decades. The planning effort includes site visits and field surveys to determine what type and how much restoration is needed, developing a proposed action, engaging the public in a collaborative way during the design phase and the NEPA phase of the project, completion of specialist reports throughout the life of the grant, and ultimately completing NEPA analysis and documentation.

The Forest would pick logical geographic areas (likely HUC 6 watersheds), complete all necessary project design and NEPA analysis, then move on the next area. The completed areas would be suitable for a restoration implementation grant submittal or other restoration funding to complete the identified work.

The Forest anticipates completing NEPA in several high priority areas and implementing restoration in these areas as part of this grant. Redding Canyon, east of Bishop is a priority area to complete analysis and implementation as part of this grant. The Forest Resource and Land Management Plan (1988) places an emphasis on protection and enhancement of springs and riparian areas in this part of the Forest. The objectives of the project would be to restore soil productivity, improve water quality, restore native plant assemblages including riparian vegetation and protect other resource values such as heritage resources. Anticipated restoration activities include: breaking up compacted soil surfaces, installing barriers, recontouring, vertical mulching with native materials, and planting native vegetation to restore these areas to a natural condition. Restoration work would be completed with a small dozer and/or a hand crew using conventional tools. The project design and NEPA analysis will provide site-specific restoration needs based on specific site conditions. GPS locating and tracking of proposed restoration is critical to the success of this project.

The Forest received funding to analyze unauthorized routes (routes not on the Motor Vehicle Use Map) for signage and additional restoration needs. These projects occur in subwatersheds contained within the Upper Owens and Bishop Creek watersheds. These projects are complimentary to the activities proposed in this grant.

Project planning would take place throughout the life of the grant. In several high priority areas implementation would likely occur in 2011/2012. Monitoring would occur in 2012/2013 and beyond.

### B. Describe how the proposed Project relates to OHV Recreation and how OHV Recreation caused the damage:

This project focuses on the restoration of unauthorized routes, which have been primarily used for OHV recreation and exploration of Forest amenities. Many of these routes contribute to high road densities and are located within sensitive areas (meadow and riparian areas, sensitive wildlife and plant habitat, cultural resource sites). In addition, some of the routes are located in highly visible areas where scenic quality is being impacted. For the reasons described above (and other reasons that are not mentioned here), these routes were not designated as part of the Travel Management Record of Decision (2009). These routes that are not authorized for OHV use are still evident on the ground, and may continue to receive some limited OHV use until restoration efforts are initiated.

This project involves restoration activities, which are an integral part of a safe and responsible, well-managed OHV program that focuses on providing a quality OHV recreation experience while minimizing impacts to natural resources. This project will ensure the long-term sustainability of motorized vehicle recreation by restoring areas that have been impacted by such use. The project area encompasses some of the highest used OHV locations across the Forest and

areas that are highly visible. Continued OHV use of unauthorized routes, illegal incursions into closed areas (such as former restoration areas), disruption/compaction of surface soils, loss of vegetation, and impacts to water quality and other sensitive resources could adversely affect OHV opportunities.

**C. Describe the size of the specific Project Area(s) in acres and/or miles**

Upper Owens Watershed: Restore approximately 571 routes (up to 158 miles). The watershed is approximately 219,750 acres.

Bishop Creek Watershed: Restore approximately 70 routes (up to 26 miles). The Watershed is approximately 129,052 acres.

**D. Monitoring and Methodology**

Monitoring would be conducted by OHV personnel on a routine basis and Forest resource specialists annually to determine the projects' effectiveness, and need for additional treatments. The project will be successful if it meets the following criteria:

- No evidence of new (illegal) OHV use in closed/restored areas
- Restored areas show signs of improved soil conditions, including reduced off-site soil erosion, and vegetative recovery

Monitoring would include the following methodologies:

Personnel would document observations (i.e. evidence of motorized vehicle incursions, such as tire tracks, reports from the public, or actual observations). If OHV use is still occurring or restoration areas are not showing signs of improvement, additional restoration work would be completed incorporating appropriate strategies to eliminate illegal OHV use and continue to improve resource conditions. These adaptive management strategies will ensure long-term success in these areas.

Photo point monitoring and observations would occur to determine if soil and vegetation conditions have improved. Photo points would be established prior to the implementation of project activities. Pre- and post project photos and observations would document the bare soil and vegetation conditions (i.e. percent ground cover, etc.). These photo points and observations would determine if vegetation cover is increasing as a result of project activities. The areas would be routinely patrolled, however formal site visits would occur at least once per summer for the first two years following implementation. The initial monitoring effort (first two growing seasons) is expected to provide some indication of vegetation recovery to determine the success of the restoration project. The Forest will conduct Best Management Practices effectiveness monitoring and complete the "OHV Trail Condition Evaluation Form" as per the Soil Conservation Plan on a subset of closed routes to track the success of the restoration effort. Depending on the success of the project, the restoration sites would be monitored at longer intervals during the next 10 years.

**E. List of Reports**

Planning would need to be conducted prior to implementation of the proposed project. The following documents would be produced from this planning effort, and would be part of the project file:

NEPA documentation - Would include the purpose and need, proposed action, public involvement efforts, and the environmental analysis. Supporting documentation includes, Biological Assessment/Evaluation for plants; Noxious Weed Risk Assessment; Biological Assessment/Evaluation for wildlife, Watershed Resource report, including a Riparian Conservation Objective analysis and Heritage Resource Report.

Monitoring Report - Includes photo points and documented observations that would be produced and updated to include project planning (pre-project monitoring), implementation, and post project monitoring information. The monitoring report would also serve as an accomplishment report, and would describe the work that was completed.

**F. Goals, Objectives and Methodology / Peer Reviews**

N/A - This restoration project does not involve scientific and/or cultural studies.

**G. Plan for Protection of Restored Area**

The restoration areas would be a focus area for patrol by OHV patrols (Forest Protection Officers) and Forest Law Enforcement Officers, as part of the ongoing monitoring, education, and enforcement efforts. In the last two years, the Forest compliment of Law Enforcement Officers (LEOs) has risen from one officer to five LEOs, greatly increasing the field presence and enforcement needed to educate the public and protect these types of restored areas. Most of the restoration areas are located in highly visible areas and would be patrolled regularly throughout the high use periods (May-October). In addition Forest personnel will visit a subset of restored routes to complete monitoring and evaluation throughout the high use periods (May-October).

As part of the restoration activities, barriers would be installed to keep motorized vehicles out of closed and restored areas. Signage would be installed and regularly maintained to insure protection of the restored area. Monitoring, as described above would also insure project success.

## Additional Documentation

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700554

**1. Project-Specific Maps**

Attachments:

[Bishop Creek Watershed](#)

[Upper Owens Watershed](#)

**2. Project-Specific Photos**

Attachments:

[Photos of typical routes in Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds](#)

## Project Cost Estimate

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:				Version # _____	APP # _____
<b>APPLICANT NAME :</b>	USFS - Inyo National Forest				
<b>PROJECT TITLE :</b>	Restoration, Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds (FINAL)			<b>PROJECT NUMBER (Division use only) :</b>	G09-02-05-R01
<b>PROJECT TYPE :</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Acquisition <input type="checkbox"/> Development <input type="checkbox"/> Education & Safety <input type="checkbox"/> Ground Operations <input type="checkbox"/> Law Enforcement <input type="checkbox"/> Planning <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Restoration				
<b>PROJECT DESCRIPTION :</b>	<p>The Inyo National Forest is proposing to do planning to determine restoration needs including full project designs and any additional environmental analysis, on approximately 641 closed routes in the Upper Owens Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC) 5 watershed (571 routes) and the Bishop Creek HUC 5 watershed (70 routes). Both these watersheds are "priority watersheds" for restoration and maintenance of water quality on the Forest. These are also municipal watersheds providing water for Southern California. These routes were not designated as part of the National Forest Transportation System (NFTS), per the Forests Record of Decision (ROD) of the Travel Management Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) signed in December of 2009 for the Inyo. Routes not designated vary from recently created user routes to routes that have been in place for several decades. The planning effort includes site visits and field surveys to determine what type and how much restoration is needed, developing a proposed action, engaging the public in a collaborative way during the design phase and the NEPA phase of the project, completion of specialist reports throughout the life of the grant, and ultimately completing NEPA analysis and documentation.</p> <p>The Forest would pick logical geographic areas (likely HUC 6 watersheds), complete all necessary project design and NEPA analysis, then move on the next area. The completed areas would be suitable for a restoration implementation grant submittal or other restoration funding to complete the identified work.</p> <p>The Forest anticipates completing NEPA in several high priority areas and implementing restoration in these areas as part of this grant. Redding Canyon, east of Bishop is a priority area to complete analysis and implementation as part of this grant. The Forest Resource and Land Management Plan (1988) places an emphasis on protection and enhancement of springs and riparian areas in this part of the Forest. The objectives of the project would be to restore soil productivity, improve water quality, restore native plant assemblages including riparian vegetation and protect other resource values such as heritage resources. Anticipated restoration activities include: breaking up compacted soil surfaces, installing barriers, recontouring, vertical mulching with native materials, and planting native vegetation to restore these areas to a natural condition. Restoration work would be completed with a small dozer and/or a hand crew using conventional tools. The project design and NEPA analysis will provide site-specific restoration needs based on specific site conditions. GPS locating and tracking of proposed restoration is critical to the success of this project.</p> <p>The Forest received funding to analyze unauthorized routes (routes not on the Motor Vehicle Use Map) for signage and additional restoration needs. These projects occur in subwatersheds contained within the Upper Owens and Bishop Creek watersheds. These projects are complimentary to the activities proposed in this grant.</p> <p>Project planning would take place throughout the life of the grant. In several high priority areas implementation would likely occur in 2011/2012. Monitoring would occur in 2012/2013 and beyond.</p>				

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Inyo National Forest  
Application: Restoration, Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>							
<b>Program Expenses</b>							
<b>1</b>	<b>Staff</b>						
	Archeologist Notes : Field surveys, Heritage Resource Report, and implementation	180.000	350.000	DAY	63,000.00	0.00	63,000.00
	Botanist Notes : Field Surveys, Biological Evaluations,and Noxious Weed Risk Assessments	155.000	350.000	DAY	54,250.00	0.00	54,250.00
	Other-Wildlife Biologist Notes : Field Surveys, Biological Evaluations	60.000	350.000	DAY	21,000.00	0.00	21,000.00
	Other-Watershed Specialist Notes : Field visits, restoration prescription development, watershed report, implementation and monitoring	115.000	350.000	DAY	35,000.00	5,250.00	40,250.00
	Other-Aquatic Biologist Notes : Field visits, biological evaluations	30.000	350.000	DAY	10,500.00	0.00	10,500.00
	Other-Recreation Specialist Notes : Field visits, recreation report, and implementation	60.000	350.000	DAY	21,000.00	0.00	21,000.00
	Other-Project Leader/Coordinator Notes : Lead project planning efforts, including developing proposed action, public involvement contact, and completing the environmental analysis. Coordinate implementation and monitoring	240.000	350.000	DAY	75,250.00	8,750.00	84,000.00
	Other-GIS/database support Notes : Manage spatial and tabular data during planning, implementation and monitoring.	90.000	250.000	DAY	22,500.00	0.00	22,500.00
	Other-Equipment Operator Notes : Implementation of restoration activities. Includes transport,	10.000	350.000	DAY	3,500.00	0.00	3,500.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Inyo National Forest  
Application: Restoration, Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	operation and equipment maintenance that is related to the restoration project.						
	Other-Restoration Crew Notes : 4 person (force account, SCA or Friends of Inyo) for 20 days to complete handwork.	80.000	150.000	DAY	12,000.00	0.00	12,000.00
	Other-Volunteers Notes : Individual and sponsored volunteers. OHV user groups, Friends of the Inyo, individuals	10.000	130.000	DAY	0.00	1,300.00	1,300.00
	Other-OHV Patrols Notes : Patrol, Monitoring and maintenance of restoration sites (i.e. signage, barriers, public education, enforcement)	20.000	175.000	DAY	3,500.00	0.00	3,500.00
	Other-Forest Recreation Officer Notes : Directly involved with project treatments, as well as supporting NEPA analysis and overall OHV program management.	40.000	400.000	DAY	0.00	16,000.00	16,000.00
	Other-Forest Resource Officer Notes : Directly involved with project treatments, as well as supporting the NEPA analysis.	30.000	400.000	DAY	0.00	12,000.00	12,000.00
	Other-Forest Planner Notes : Provide advise and oversee completion of environmental documentation	10.000	350.000	DAY	0.00	3,500.00	3,500.00
	<b>Total for Staff</b>				321,500.00	46,800.00	368,300.00
<b>2</b>	<b>Contracts</b>						
<b>3</b>	<b>Materials / Supplies</b>						
	Other-Tools Notes : Tools to complete restoration work including: carsonite sign installer, shovels, rakes, water containers, rock bars, etc.	1.000	500.000	EA	0.00	500.00	500.00
	Other-Carsonite Signs	275.000	30.000	EA	8,250.00	0.00	8,250.00

Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Inyo National Forest  
Application: Restoration, Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
	Notes : Carsonite signs and stickers for closed routes						
	<b>Total for Materials / Supplies</b>				8,250.00	500.00	8,750.00
<b>4</b>	<b>Equipment Use Expenses</b>						
	Other-vehicle mileage Forest Vehicles Notes : Estimated mileage for survey, design and completion of NEPA analysis, implementation and monitoring for a variety of Forest vehicles. These vehicles were purchased with Forest Service funds. Resource Specialist Vehicles - 24,000 miles Project Leader/Coordinator - 5,000 miles OHV patrol = 1,000 miles Restoration Crew =1,000 miles Equipment Operator = 1,000 miles	32000.00 0	0.500	EA	0.00	16,000.00	16,000.00
	Other-Monthly fleet rental fee (FOR) Notes : Monthly cost for vehicles in support of design, survey and completion of NEPA analysis for the proposed project areas. These vehicles were purchased with Forest Service funds. Resource Specialist Vehicles - 36 months Project Leader/Coordinator - 12 months OHV patrol = 1 month Restoration Crew = 1 month Total = 50 months over 3 years	50.000	325.000	EA	0.00	16,250.00	16,250.00
	<b>Total for Equipment Use Expenses</b>				0.00	32,250.00	32,250.00
<b>5</b>	<b>Equipment Purchases</b>						
	Other-GPS units Notes : GPS units will be used to record specific restoration needs per route. The GPS units requested are "mapping grade" and are the lowest cost units with the features that are necessary for this project including a data dictionary.	2.000	1000.000	EA	1,000.00	1,000.00	2,000.00



Project Cost Estimate for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Inyo National Forest  
Application: Restoration, Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Qty	Rate	UOM	Grant Request	Match	Total
<b>6</b>	<b>Others</b>						
	Other-Little Hot Creek Notes : The Forest has received money and will be implementing restoration on routes in Little Hot Creek Watershed which is nested in the Upper Owens watershed.	1.000	100000.000	EA	0.00	100,000.00	100,000.00
	Other-Coyote Notes : The Forest has received money and will be implementing restoration on routes in the Coyote area which is in the Bishop Creek watershed.	1.000	30000.000	EA	0.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
	<b>Total for Others</b>				0.00	130,000.00	130,000.00
<b>7</b>	<b>Indirect Costs</b>						
	Indirect Costs-OHV restoration program Notes : OHV Restoration Program and Grant Administration, including program oversight, supervision, budgeting, tracking budget expenditures, billing, record keeping, etc.	1.000	30000.000	EA	0.00	30,000.00	30,000.00
	<b>Total Program Expenses</b>				330,750.00	240,550.00	571,300.00
	<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>				330,750.00	240,550.00	571,300.00
	<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>				<b>330,750.00</b>	<b>240,550.00</b>	<b>571,300.00</b>

Project Cost Summary for Grants and Cooperative Agreements Program - 2009/2010  
Agency: USFS - Inyo National Forest  
Application: Restoration, Upper Owens and Bishop Creek Watersheds (FINAL)

3/1/2010

	Line Item	Grant Request	Match	Total	Narrative
<b>DIRECT EXPENSES</b>					
<b>Program Expenses</b>					
1	Staff	321,500.00	46,800.00	368,300.00	The Forest has multiple staff in each discipline to complete this work. As an example, there are currently two full - time Botanists on the Forest. Temporary staff is hired during the summer to complete priority field work, assessments and reports to supplement the full-time staff. Cost estimates are for the three year performance period.
2	Contracts	0.00	0.00	0.00	
3	Materials / Supplies	8,250.00	500.00	8,750.00	Cost estimates are for the three year performance period.
4	Equipment Use Expenses	0.00	32,250.00	32,250.00	Cost estimates are for the three year performance period.  Forest Service vehicles costs, other than those purchased with OHV funds, are charged per mile as well as a monthly "rental rate" which is the "FOR."
5	Equipment Purchases	1,000.00	1,000.00	2,000.00	
6	Others	0.00	130,000.00	130,000.00	
7	Indirect Costs	0.00	30,000.00	30,000.00	
<b>Total Program Expenses</b>		330,750.00	240,550.00	571,300.00	
<b>TOTAL DIRECT EXPENSES</b>		330,750.00	240,550.00	571,300.00	
<b>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</b>		<b>330,750.00</b>	<b>240,550.00</b>	<b>571,300.00</b>	



## Environmental Review Data Sheet (ERDS)

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700554

### ITEM 1 and ITEM 2

#### ITEM 1

- a. ITEM 1 - Has a CEQA Notice of Determination (NOD) been filed for the Project? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)

#### ITEM 2

- b. Does the proposed Project include a request for funding for CEQA and/or NEPA document preparation prior to implementing the remaining Project Deliverables (i.e., is it a two-phased Project pursuant to Section 4970.06.1(b)) (Please select Yes or No) ☒ Yes ☐ No

### ITEM 3 - Project under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378

- c. ITEM 3 - Are the proposed activities a "Project" under CEQA Guidelines Section 15378? ☐ Yes ☒ No  
(Please select Yes or No)
- d. The Application is requesting funds solely for personnel and support to enforce OHV laws and ensure public safety. These activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No
- e. Other. Explain why proposed activities would not cause any physical impacts on the environment and are thus not a "Project" under CEQA. DO NOT complete ITEMS 4 – 10

### ITEM 4 - Impact of this Project on Wetlands

### ITEM 5 - Cumulative Impacts of this Project

### ITEM 6 - Soil Impacts

### ITEM 7 - Damage to Scenic Resources

### ITEM 8 - Hazardous Materials

Is the proposed Project Area located on a site included on any list compiled pursuant to Section 65962.5 of the California Government Code (hazardous materials)? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

If YES, describe the location of the hazard relative to the Project site, the level of hazard and the measures to be taken to minimize or avoid the hazards.

### ITEM 9 - Potential for Adverse Impacts to Historical or Cultural Resources

Would the proposed Project have potential for any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources? (Please select Yes or No) ☐ Yes ☒ No

Discuss the potential for the proposed Project to have any substantial adverse impacts to historical or cultural resources.

### ITEM 10 - Indirect Significant Impacts

**CEQA/NEPA Attachment**

## Evaluation Criteria

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY:

Version # \_\_\_\_\_

APP # 700554

### 1. Project Cost Estimate - Q 1. (Auto populates from Cost Estimate)

1. As calculated on the Project Cost Estimate, the percentage of the Project costs covered by the Applicant is: 3

(Note: This field will auto-populate once the Cost Estimate and Evaluation Criteria are Validated.) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ 76% or more (10 points)  
☐ 51% - 75% (5 points)  
☒ 26% - 50% (3 points)  
☐ 25% (Match minimum) (No points)

### 2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Q 2.

2. Natural and Cultural Resources - Failure to fund the Project will result in adverse impacts to: 9

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Domestic water supply (4 points)  
☐ Archeological and historical resources identified in the California Register of Historical Resources or the Federal Register of Historic Places (3 points )  
☒ Stream or other watercourse (3 points)  
☒ Soils - Site actively eroding (2 points)  
☒ Sensitive areas (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of sensitive habitats [riparian areas, wetlands, Steam Management Zones (SMZ's)]  
☒ Threatened and Endangered (T&E) listed species (2 point each, up to a maximum of 6) Enter number of T&E species [Lahontan cutthroat trout]  
☒ Other special-status species- Number of special-status species (1 point each, up to a maximum of 3) Enter number of special-status species [Northern Goshawk, Greater Sage Grouse, Mono Lake Lupine]

Describe the type and severity of impacts that might occur relative to the checked item(s):

The restoration activities are designed to restore soil productivity, reduce impacts to water quality, riparian areas and other sensitive resources such as sensitive plants and heritage resources. The restoration activities will also restore native plant assemblages. Perennial stream channels in the Upper Owens watershed, including the Owens River and the Bishop Creek watershed, including Bishop Creek provide municipal water for Southern California. Priority areas for planning and implementation include routes within stream management zones (SMZ's) and riparian areas. Compaction, and the lack of vegetative cover (bare ground) are leading to increases in off-site erosion and stream sedimentation, impacting water quality and aquatic habitat. The Forest will likely employ restoration techniques such as blocking vehicular traffic, breaking up the compacted soil, and providing ground cover. In some cases native plants will be utilized to facilitate rapid native vegetative community re-colonization.

### 3. Reason for Project - Q 3.

3. Reason for the Project 1

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ Protect special-status species or cultural site (4 points)  
☐ Restore natural resource system damaged by OHV activity (4 points)  
☐ OHV activity in a closed area (3 points)  
☐ Alternative measures attempted, but failed (2 points)

- ☐ Management decision (1 point)
- ☐ Scientific and cultural studies (1 point)
- ☒ Planning efforts associated with Restoration (1 point)

Reference Document

On-going field observations made by OHV technicians and resource specialists, as well as data collected in preparation for the Travel Management EIS (2009) indicate that current condition is inconsistent with the Inyo National Forest LRMP (1988) as amended by the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA) (2004). Routes proposed for analysis and restoration were not designated as part of the Forests transportation system the Travel Management EIS (2009).

**4. Measures to Ensure Success - Q 4.**

4. Measures to ensure success –The Project makes use of the following elements to ensure successful implementation 10

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 2 points each (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Site monitoring to prevent additional damage
- ☒ Construction of barriers and other traffic control devices
- ☒ Use of native plants and materials
- ☒ Incorporation of universally recognized 'Best Management Practices'
- ☐ Educational signage
- ☒ Identification of alternate OHV routes to ensure that OHV activities will not reoccur in restored area

Explain each item checked above:

As described above in the "Project Description", project activities specifically includes installation of barriers to discourage motor vehicle use, decompacting soils, vertical mulching, raking, revegetation with native plants, signage and monitoring. The Forest has extensive experience implementing 'Best Management Practices.' 'Best Management Practices' would be incorporated into the project design and implementation to ensure water quality and other forest resources are protected. A Forest Watershed Specialists will assist in designing, implementing and monitoring the project. The Forest is in the process of signing all routes designated as "open" as part of implementing the 2009 Travel Management EIS. Recreationists would be able to clearly see and utilize alternative routes.

**5. Publicly Reviewed Plan - Q 5.**

5. Is there a publicly reviewed and adopted plan (e.g., wilderness designation, land management plans, route designation decisions) that supports the need for the Restoration Project? 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☐ No (No points)
- ☒ Yes (5 points)

Identify plan

Inyo National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (1988), Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (2004) and the Travel Management Environmental Impact Statement (2009). The Forest will be conducting additional environmental analysis to determine restoration techniques on currently unauthorized routes.

**6. Primary Funding Source - Q 6.**

6. Primary funding source for future operational costs associated with the Project will be: 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ Applicant's operational budget (5 points)
- ☐ Volunteer support and/or donations (3 points)
- ☐ Other Grant funding (2 points)

☐ OHV Trust Funds (No points)

If 'Operational budget' is checked, list reference document(s):

It is anticipated that the Forest's operational budget would be the primary funding source utilized to support future operational costs associated with this project, although other types of funding listed above may also be utilized where feasible, appropriate, and necessary to supplement the Forest's operational budget. The Forest has been actively utilizing Legacy Roads and Trails and Watershed funding to support these types of restoration projects (Region 5 budget direction for FY10, updated 2/2010). The Inyo NF will also continue to utilize volunteers and partnerships to support future operational needs related to this project.

**7. Public Input - Q 7.**

7. The Project was developed with public input employing the following 2

(Check all that apply) Scoring: 1 point each, up to a maximum of 2 points (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Publicly noticed meeting(s) with the general public to discuss Project (1 point)  
☐ Conference call(s) with interested parties (1 point)  
☒ Meeting(s) with stakeholders (1 point)

Explain each statement that was checked

The topic has been discussed over multiple stakeholder meetings, including the OHV leadership forum. Numerous public meetings were held during the development of the Travel Management EIS. In addition, a collaborative public group made recommendations on the Travel Management plan as to which routes they would like open and which ones to close. Public input will be solicited during the NEPA process for this proposal to help the Forest determine appropriate restoration techniques on a site-specific basis.

**8. Utilization of Partnerships - Q 8.**

8. The Project will utilize partnerships to successfully accomplish the Project. The number of partner organizations that will participate in the Project are 4

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

- ☒ 4 or more (4 points) ☐ 2 to 3 (2 points)  
☐ 1 (1 point) ☐ None (No points)

List partner organization(s):

Friends of the Inyo, Eastern Sierra Four Wheel Drive, Advocates for Access to Public Lands, Student Conservation Association (SCA), Sierra Club

**9. Scientific and Cultural Studies - Q 9.**

9. Scientific and cultural studies will 6

(Check all that apply) (Please select applicable values)

- ☒ Determine appropriate Restoration techniques (2 points)  
☒ Examine potential effects of OHV Recreation on natural or cultural resources (2 points)  
☒ Examine methods to ensure success of Restoration efforts (1 point)  
☒ Lead to direct management action (1 point)

Explain each item checked above

The planning effort, including prescription development and field surveys along with experience with similar restoration projects will determine appropriate restoration techniques for implementation. The planning effort will also reveal the site-specific effects of OHV recreation on critical natural and cultural resources. The monitoring effort would be documented and would focus on further documenting which techniques are the most cost effective and accomplish the goals of restoration.



**10. Underlying Problem - Q 10.**

10. The underlying problem that resulted in the need for the Restoration Project has been effectively addressed and resolved 3

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☐ No (No points)

☒ Yes (3 points)

Explain 'Yes' answer

The routes planned for analysis and restoration were not designated (aka unauthorized routes) for motor vehicle use in the Forests' Travel Management EIS (2009). These routes will not be displayed on the Motor Vehicle Use Map (MVUM) which is provided to the public displaying routes authorized for motor vehicle use. It is anticipated that incursion into these unauthorized roads will decrease with the publication of the MVUM along with clear route and restoration signing. This grant proposes to make determinations, with public input, which routes will be restored, and what techniques will be employed or if part of the route will be converted to non-motorized uses such as a hiking trail. Protection and enhancement of natural and cultural resources will be achieved by implementing the 2009 Travel Management EIS.

**11. Size of sensitive habitats - Q 11.**

11. Size of sensitive habitats (e.g., wilderness, riparian, wetlands, ACEC) within the Project Area which will be restored 5

(Check the one most appropriate) (Please select one from list)

☒ Greater than 10 acres (5 points)

☐ 1 – 10 acres (3 points)

☐ Less than 1 acre (1 points)

☐ No sensitive habitat within Project Area (No points)